

ETAAC errata sheet for Draft Final Report

For discussion at Feb. 11, 2008 meeting

ETAAC members: Please use this chart to specify any errors, typos or points for discussion you may see in the draft final report. Please include chapter #, page #, the text as it currently exists (enough words to uniquely identify the text or concept on the page), and either your preferred modified text or comment for discussion. (Table cells should expand to accommodate the length of your entry). Under significance, please indicate major if you believe the suggested change warrants group discussion, or minor for simple typographical errors that don't significantly change the meaning and thus are not worthy of discussion. Extend the table (add rows) as necessary. See examples below. Please coordinate through your sector lead so they can transmit to me (schurch@arb.ca.gov) by 4pm on Sunday, Feb. 10 (so I have time to process before the Monday morning meeting).

Submitter's Name: Ed Pike

<u>Chapter #</u>	<u>Page #</u>	<u>Existing text</u>	<u>Desired text or comment</u>	<u>My response!!!</u>
6	5	Electricity paragraph refers to future event on Jan 1 2008	update that event has taken place (or not)	The self-gen program sunsets as of 1/08 so it NOW needs to be fixed –leave as is
6	7	Possible solutions paragraph	Department of Food and Agriculture,;	okay
6	7	under GHG Reduction potential there is a Typo: 3600 M MW	3600 M MW – also sentences are ungrammatical (if you care, there are also a few on p6-3 last paragraph, 6-5 3 rd paragraph, 6-8 2 nd paragraph, p6-10 2 nd paragraph) See changes you noted in last column	Okay to delete M as clearly not million MW, it was late in the draft. I was moving fast, speed-reading the earlier 5 chapters, etc. 6-3: <i>Responsible Parties:</i> For permitting: the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) and regional water quality control boards; the California Air Resources Board (CARB) and local air quality management districts. For energy policy: pricing and funding, the California Energy Commission (CEC), California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) and the California Pollution Control Financing Authority. For implementation and funding: private anaerobic digestion companies, dairy owners, producer groups and local governments. For overall state policy: the California Environmental Protection Agency (Cal/EPA) and member boards, offices and departments at the California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA). Page 6-5 under Electricity: Review existing agricultural tax

				<p>determine change as follows: Existing agricultural tariffs need to be reviewed to determine</p> <p>Page 6-8: <i>Responsible Parties:</i> For permitting: SWRCB and regional water quality control boards, CARB and local air quality management districts. For energy policy: pricing and funding the CEC, CPUC and CPCFA. For implementation and funding of anaerobic digester technology companies, dairy owners, processors, groups and local governments. For overall state policy: CDFG, member boards, offices and departments and CDFA.</p> <p>Page 6-10: This is the last sentence in Responsible Parties. For permitting of new biofuels facilities, the SWRCB and regional water quality control boards, CARB and local air quality management districts, and local land authorities.</p> <p>Change as follows:</p> <p>The SWRCB, regional water quality control boards, CARB, regional water quality management districts, and local land authorities should coordinate for permitting of new biofuels facilities</p>
6	8	Co-benefits/mitigation paragraph	“These facilities would provide energy and national security <u>benefits</u> because ...	okay
6	10	Problem description paragraph	Several commodity crops in California suffer from diminishing markets and the ability to shift to bio-fuel crops would help farmers with new options in crop rotations, <u>particularly in areas with marginal farmland (to avoid food production impact) that produce feedstocks for advanced</u> technology	Pls change as noted here, I noted marginal land issue or which should suffice

			<p>including production of is readily available to more efficiently convert sugar and starch crops to ethanol while minimizing emissions. ethanol while minimizing emissions. The development of this technology, however, requires market certainty market certainty and <u>RD&D support</u>. At present, there is no established State funding for bio-fuel field crop RD&D. Unfortunately, other Federal and private grants are not being directed to California bio-fuel field production research.</p>	
			<p><i>Possible Solutions:</i> California government can send a strong market signal that there is a long- term bio-fuels market in California by making it a policy and regulatory priority. <u>Implementation of the LCFS is an important opportunity to allow low-carbon biofuels to compete in the marketplace.</u></p>	okay
6	10	I suggest adding this language after the 1 st paragraph of “possible solutions”	<p><u>“Growing biofuel crops on otherwise productive cropland, at the expense of other food, feed, or fiber production, is not a desirable outcome as this would displace this production elsewhere, in some degree indirectly leading to land use change and high GHG emissions (Searchinger, 2008). California should develop a program for novel biofuel crops that conducts intensive research and development on promising crops such as sweet sorghum, cover crops and bioremediation crops targeted to</u></p>	okay if delete one sentence as noted that is addressed o not agree biofuel program can ONLY be on marginal la

			<u>marginal lands. Production tax credits - tied to marginal land production - could provide incentives.”</u>	
6	10	I suggest adding this language after the 2nd paragraph of “possible solutions”	<u>“California can take advantage of this important synergy through either in-state or out-of-state corn production from states with high corn productions, as California produces a large variety of other high-quality food crops.”</u>	I am not sure I understand this. Does this mean corn-ba an okay thing? If so, that is not msg I want to send in a
6	12	Ease of implementation paragraph	Correct page number reference to NUGGET	Pg 15
6	20	Item #14 refers to recommendation that is not included in the report	Delete, unless this recommendation is in the report somewhere – the table is very helpful, and it would be useful in general to cross-reference back to recommendations (see electricity/gas chapter)	it IS mentioned a couple places so leave as is unless yo noted where it is stated that I can provide
6	11	Move #19 footnote behind second sentence of first paragraph under E. Soil Carbon Sequestration chapter and get make “combined” regular vs italics	Replace #19 footnote on page 6-22 with following: Horwath, W.R. 2005. Carbon cycling and formation of soil organic matter. <i>In</i> , Encyclopedia of Soil Science and Technology. W. Chesworth (Ed.), Kluwer Academic Publishers, the Netherlands.	This is a newer citation and is from UCD prof who hel this section